Present

App. F. IX-4

Previous References

1935-4 (May)

File No. 317-33

Serial Nos. 1

Later References.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos.

Part B for April 35

SUBJECT

Arrears of pay and pensions claimed by the Servants of Gaekwad the late Sir Sayajirao Gaekwad Baroda

Govt No 1073 of 13. 2. 35 to Dr Krishnamachari & other Central Servants.

WD 01965—GPB—15,000—7-7-34

Rejects the petition as Govt see no reason to interfere with the Orders of the Inquiry Commissioner.

Abdul Sattar

In the matter of certain arrears claimed by the archaka and other temple servants of Ganagadakallpe Sri Anjaneya Swami temple - Tumkur Taluk.

[App. F. III—2

General and Revenue Secretariat | Mysore File No. 317 of 1933-34

Serial No.	
1	Petition of 1.3.34 from Archaka Krishnacharya, and other temple Servants of Ganagadakallpe Sri Anjaneya Swami temple - Tumkur Taluk appealing against the order of the Mysore Commissioner Communicated to the archaka and others on 7.8.33 through the Amildar Tumkur, Re: payment of Rs 453:7-10 on account of pay and pariken from October 1918 to the end of December 1919
	As seen in the Endst of 7.8.33 issued from the Amildar Tumkur the petitioner's appeal subject is dt 15/7/33 the M.C.'s order was Evidently to him time, the petitioner appear before the M.C. filed another petition on 4.11.33 on which he has ordered that he is not prepared to review the order of his predecessor. is dated 28/11/33) - Hence this appealed against the order dated 8/5/33)
M.	

WD 0434—GPB—15,000—12-10-33

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

Serial No.

The appeal is admissible is to proceed

17/3 The records may perhaps be called for 11 A

19/3/34 A - may be done.

19/3/34

2nd Mr)

20/3

20/3

SECOND ... OF ICL
21 MAR 1934
No. 6024

24/3

27/3

Memo of forwardal form up entire P. L. D is for kind signature

27/3

Secret L.M.C Wire No. 1307

28-3-34

Letter no 1267/33-34 of 18. 12. 1934 from the Mysore Commissioner - for issuing proceedings relating to the claim put forward by certain Servants of Sri Anjaneyaswami temple at Gangadakuppe - Tumkur Taluk for arrears of pay and subsistance amounts

Remove petition from Archaka Krishnacharya and others praying for payment of amount to which they are entitled.

28/3

[App. F. III—2

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. | of 193

Serial No.

10) The temple in question is a minor inam endowed with inam lands, the income from which is Rs 786-4-5 as seen from the Scale Bath which is in force from 1st Jany 1920. (Vide para 2 of S.C.'s letter of 22.11.19 in mem 801-18-4). The petrs claim pay and paddi for fasli 1918 to the end of dec 1919; this is a period when in fact no Scale was in force and records do not show if the income from lands of the temple during that period was kept in S.B. account to the credit of the temple - No where definitely in the records it is stated when the Govt were directing the assumption of the management of the temple lands was issued and with which date effect was given to the said order. Even ref is invited to the M.C's enquiry of 22-3-32. Whether in July 1918 or in Aug/18 the Assumption the management may have been ordered, the records do not indicate if the inam lands were leased out during the period of the claim in question & any portion realised credited to the funds of the temple. Further the period in question is one when no Shanmadavis were functioning and the temple was controlled by Govt appointed Trustees (Vide the O.C. Yet enjoined of the claim in question.

WD 0494—GPB—15,000—12 10-33

NOTE—Contn Sheet

965
1734

Mary File No. of 193 | General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No.

Pay and Kantara Charges etc from 1.1.20 were Sanctioned as per Scale in G.O. no 29 x 10-11/Mary 4 dy - 21 - 2 dy 6/12/21 - The previous Charges now claimed ie from Dec 18 to the end of Dec should have been claimed at the same time of Sanction Sought prior to Dec 1921 if the Pet's claim was a real one & if they had used it during the period to which it relates in stead of an application at the one made on 7-2-22 x d when the question came up before the then M.C. Mr. Harold Hunter (Mr. S. Thiruniggi) he held that the claim was highly belated & not substantiated by satisfactory evidence & the Pet's was rejected on 4-7-33. x 7 forms Charges Time Bar

Again a review application was before the present M.C. who also rejected the Pet's on 21-11-33 x It is stated there no good grounds exist for a consideration of the Claim specially at this distance of time over 15 years ~~Harries~~ Pet's before the Pet's & also receiving ~~our~~ Govt. Sanct for Arrs of the Case

Hence fresh for a hearing

The above explains the Case. Two previous M.C's have declined to ~~sanction~~ sanction the Claim on the ground that the claim is belated & there is no satisfactory explanation for the delay. It is for orders if the Case is to be heard on

Please speak to me 12/1/35

1933 MAY 36 F. 13-2-35

Re: arrears of pay & pensions.

[App. F. III—2

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. 317 of 1933

Serial No.

Re appeal rejected. 6/2/35

Ch: Secy) 15 6/2 8/2/35 6/2/35

2nd member -

16) Maybe rejected

SO2 9/2 9/2

17) O/C Asst

GS 4/2 18)

4 No 1073 of 13.2.35 to Mr Krishnamachar and other Servants of Sri Anjaneya Swamie - Gavaga to Kuppe Hebbur Hubli. Trustee Tumkur against withholding their appeal petition is rejected. Memo No 1074 of 13.2.35 to the Inam Commissioner forwarding copy of the petition for his information, returning records received from him on the subject.

Petition of 15/4/35 from Area Krishnamachar of Gavagada Kuppe Sri Anjaneya Swami temple - Hebbur Tumkur Tk praying on behalf of other pujaris

OS 13/2/35

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

WD 01955—GPB—22,500—12 6-34

Anjaneya Swami Temple — Nellore Town
1610

MCG File No. of 193 General and Revenue Secretariat

of the temple and of himself that does
issued to him in Instr no 1073 & 13-2-35
be reviewed and their request for payment
of padikara Etc Charges for the period from
October 1918 to the end of Decr 1919 granted.

1) The then M.C. Mr S. Hiranmaiah after a good deal of investigation held that the claim of the petitioners being highly belated is not supported by satisfactory evidence - On this ground the pet^n was rejected -
The succeeding M.C rejected a review of the order passed by his predecessor - It is against this an appeal came up before Govt + the orders communicated to the petitioners vide as in Instr no 1073 & 13/2/35 X S.
Now the petitioners prays for a review of the above order - It is noted that no fresh grounds have been adduced to admit of any reconsideration -

Govt 10/4

2) This is only an interim memo - It is not a petition & is not duly stamped - No action seems necessary on this

10/4/35

Ch: Secy)

3) RR 28/4/35 V 23/4. Dec 2444

CHIEF SECRETARY
APR





Mys 317-337

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS

THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,

(Muzarai Section,)

Appeal Case No. 36 of 1933-34.

Appellants:- 1. Krishnamachary
Son of Srinivasachar,
Archak of Sri Anjaneya Swami
Temple at Garagada Koppe,
Hebbur Hobli, Tumkur Taluk.

2. Linga, son of Nanje Gowda,

3. Narasa, son of Putta,
2 and 3 Kavalgars of the
above Temple.

4. Thimma, son of Pulageru,

5. Byata, son of Thimma,
4 and 5 Bhajantries of the
above Temple.

==Versus==

Respondent:- G o v e r n m e n t.

The Appellants beg to prefer this Appeal against the Order of the Muzarai Commissioner in Mysore, Bangalore, No. D-2, Dis.398 of 33-34, dated 28-11-1933, declining to review the order passed by his predecessor in D.2-Dis.42 of 33-34, dated 11-7-1933, rejecting the claim of the Appellants for Rs.455-7-10, being the pay and 'Paditara' due for the period from October, 1918 to end of December, 1919, on the ground that the claim is belated and that there are no sufficient

sufficient reasons for the delay, for the rollow among other, reasons:-

(Copy of the Order appealed against is enclosed.)

Facts of the Case.

1. Sri Anjaneya Swami Temple at Garagada - Kuppe is a Muzarai Institution, endowed with two Devadaya Inam Villages, viz., Garagada Kuppe and Thimmasandra in Tumkur Taluk, and the Appellants are the hereditary temple servants.

2. The Temple and the Inam Villages were under the management of Hebbur Rama Rao, descendant of the late Vakil Ramappa, the original grantee and the Manager, and owing to mismanagement, these were taken under Government management in August 1918, as per Government Order.

3. The Appellants were receiving remuneration and 'Padithara' from the late Manager during his time and after the Temple and the properties came under Government management, the Appellants were told to continue services in the Temple as before on the promise that they would be remunerated for the services and Viniyogas as per scale to be fixed from the income of the Inam Villages. The first Appellant received the Taluk Amildar's orders to this effect, through the Hobli Sheikdar (Copy enclosed).

4. A scale of income and expenditure was sanctioned for this Temple in 1919-20, and the pay and 'Padithara' were disbursed to the Appellants from January, 1920, as per Scale; but the

arrears

arrears of pay and 'Padithara' amounting to Rupees 455-7-10, due to them, as per Bills submitted by - the Amildar for the period from October 1918 to end of December, 1919, have not been paid in spite of several petitions and representations.

5. Bills for this amount were submitted by the Deputy Commissioner for sanction and the claim was rejected by the Muzarai Commissioner on the grounds that it was belated and that there were no sufficient reasons for the delay.

Grounds of Appeal.

I. The reasons given in the Muzarai Commissioner's Order are not sound. The first Appellant began to agitate for pay and 'Padithara' in the year 1918 alone, and he has submitted Kerch Pattis every month to the Taluk Amildar from the - date the Government assumed management of the - Temple in August, 1918, requesting payment. He has, besides, submitted several petitions not less than 2 or 3 every year from 1918, and a detailed list of petitions with dates, is submitted herein below for kind reference. (Copies of petitions and endorsements issued in some cases are also enclosed for kind perusal). The delay has taken place in the Taluk and other Offices for completing the enquiry and working up the records, and it is not fair and just to make the Appellants suffer for the delay caused in the above offices.

II. The Appellants have rendered services and expenditure for 'Nityagatle'and 'Hetchakatle' Viniyogas has been actually incurred as per Tumkur

Amildar's No. 354 of 11-11-1918, communicated to the first Appellant through the Hobli Sheikdar.

III. The claim has been established on local enquiry conducted by the Hobli Revenue Inspector, and the Amildar, and the Dharmadarsis - have also resolved in favour of the Appellants. It has been recommended by the local Huzarai Officer and the Deputy Commissioner.

IV. The Order of the Huzarai Commissioner is unjust and inequitable and has hit hard the - Appellants who have suffered loss to an extent of Rs.600/- as they had to pay heavy interest.

Wherefore the Appellants pray that the Benign Government may be graciously pleased to - peruse the records and sanction the sum of - - Rs.4[illegible]-7-10, due to them for the above period on account of pay and Paditharа as per Bills submitted by the Amildar, condoning the delay, as recommended by the Deputy Commissioner.

Bangalore,
1st arch, 1934.

Date on which petitions were submitted:-

8-4-21; 2[illegible]-10-21; 7-3-22; 20-7-22; 24-3-22; [illegible]-3-24; 4-12-26; 28-4-27; 10-10-28; 14-9-28; 18-[illegible]-28; [illegible]-9-29;

Besides the above nine Reports have also been submitted for 18-19.

forwarded with compliments to the Huzarai Commissioner in favour of Subrmitta the records connected with the Appeal petition - By order

27/3/34

for Financial Secretary



Dr. Or. 398/33-34

Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.
Dated Bangalore 28-11-33.

Endorsement granted to

Petition Reg: No. PC 175/33-34
Dated 4-11-33.
Subject:-
Praying for a re-consideration of this office order rejecting the claim for certain arrears of pay and pachitar due to servants of Sri Anjaneyaswami Temple at Gangadakuppe, Tumkur Taluk

Krishnamachar and others of Gangadakuppe Tumkur Taluk through P. Seetharamaiah Pleader Tumkur in reply to his Petition Registered No. as per margin

---

The Petitioners are informed that the undersigned declines to review the order of his predecessor.

Sd/ N. Madhavarao
Muzrai Commissioner

Copy applied for by archak Krishnachar on 19.12.33
Copy ready on 20-12-33
" delivered on
No. of words 65
Copying fees 0-2-0
Comparing " 0-0-6
0-2-6

" Copy

Comparedby S Jayaramaiah
Comparedby K Ramaiah

M Ramaswamaiah
Manager
Muzrai Office

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 11.11.1915 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

(Sd) M. Sreenivasaiah

30.11.15

[illegible]

11/2/34

OFFICE OF THE ...
TUMKUR DISTRICT.

ಸಿಪಿಸಿ-1230
01-92

ಗಾ
(436)
ಕೃಷಿ ಸಚಿವಾಂ ದಿನ 1-7-91ರಲ್ಲಿ ಜರ್ಮನಿ ರಿಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್‌ಗೆ ಭೇಟಿ ನೀಡಿದ್ದರು.

ಸಿಪಿಸಿ-1230
01-92

[illegible] 1920 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

1-7-918 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible] 6-2-22

1230/1921-22

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

25-2-22 [illegible]

No. Pet 130/1928 ಬೆಳ್ಳಿ

ತುಮಕೂರು ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್

ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿಕಮಿಷನರ್ ಸಾಹೇಬರವರು

ಕಂದಿಕೆರೆ ಹೋಬಳಿ ಕೈದಾಳ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರ್ ೧೫೬ರಲ್ಲಿ ೧೦ ಎಕರೆ ೧೨ ಗುಂಟೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಪೈಸಲು ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಸಿ. ಬಸವಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪನವರಿಗೆ ಕ್ರಯಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಡುವ ವಿಷಯ.

ಯಿಂಡಾರಸ್ಸು

ನಿಮ್ಮ ೭.೭.೧೯೨೮. ನೇ ಮರ್ಮಂ ಅರ್ಜಿ

ತಿರುನಿ ಗಾಲ್ಡ ಕೊರವಾಡಿ ವೀರಪ್ಪರವರ ಎಳ್ಳಾರ

ಮೇಲಿನ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ದೊಡ್ಡಪ್ಪ ದೇವಾಲಯ

ನಬ್‌ಡಿನಿರ್ಜ ಆಫೀಸರವರಿಗೆ ~~ಪೈಸಲು ಬಗ್ಗೆ~~ ವಿಚಾರಿಸಬಹುದೆಂದು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರುತ್ತೆ.

ತಾ|| ೭/೭/೨೮

B. O.

Nseshasesle

Dist. Sheristedar.

೯/೭

N.Dis&Pet 2269
30-31

తారీఖు 24-6-1931

తాండాందర్ద మేంబే

తహసీలుదారు సాహెబు గారికి సలాము చేసి వ్రాయునది ఏమనగా మా
పట్టా భూమిలో కొలువుకు తగ్గిన లంకలు మా పేర్లకు మ్యుటేషన్ చేసి ఇవ్వమని
పదిమంది రిక్వెస్టులు ఇచ్చినారు. కాబట్టి సర్వే చేయించి మ్యుటేషన్ చేసి
ఇవ్వవలసినదని కోరుచున్నాము.

Thumb impression

For Deputy Commissioner
Tahsildar
6/6/31

12 7 Enc
38-34, 4 Files

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE

Bangalore, 17th December 1934
18

CHIEF SECRETARIAT
18 DEC. 1934

GENL & REV. SECRETARIAT
738
19 DEC 1934
MUZRAI DEPT.

FROM

N. MADHAVA RAU, ESQ, B A, B L,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore

To

Rajasevasakta
R. Ranga Rao, Esq., M.A., B.L.,
Chief *Secretary to the Government of His Highness*
the Maharaja of Mysore
Bangalore.

Mus 317-33-3

SIR,

Claim of certain servants of the Anjanevaswami Temple at Garagadahuppe, Tumkur Taluk, for arrears of pay and Sadhara amounts.

With reference to your Memo No.1307/Muz. dated 28-9-1934, re: the above, I have the honor to forward herewith the Circle file of papers received with letter No.3458/Secl. dated 15th December 1934 from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, together with bills of five collectors of Sadhara for 1933-34 which explain the facts of the case.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
N. Madhava Rau
Muzrai Commissioner.

GENL. & REV. SECRETARY
736
1921

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

No. 1073 Bangalore, Dated 12th February 1935

Mzg 317-33-4

ENDORSEMENT.

To

Mr. Krishnachar and other Servants of the
Temple of Sri Anjaneyaswami at
Saragana Koppe, Tebtur Hobli,
Tumkur Taluk.

With reference to petition dated 1.3.1934, filed by them appealing against the orders of the Huzrai Commissioner re: their claim for certain arrears of pay and paditara from October 1918 to the end of December 1919, the petitioners are informed that their petition is rejected as there are no reasons to interfere with the orders of the Huzrai Commissioner in the matter.

By Order,

Sd/- P. Pange Rao,
Chief Secretary to Govern...

P.T.O.

Memo No. 1074 & 4 files Dated, 12th Feb. 1935

Copy of the foregoing is forwarded, with compliments, to the Puzrai Commissioner in Mysore, for information, returning records received with his letter No.1267/33-3 dated 19.12.1934.

By Order,

for Chief Secretary to Government

4/12.2.35.

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

5 Cdts

Diary No. of letter replied to 738-34

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

Date of issue 13-2-35

Signed by Muddukrishnappa

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

Section

File No. 317-33

Serial No. 4.

No. 1073

To

Mr Krishnaraja and other Servants of the Govt Hole of Sri Anjaneyaswami at Gangadeva Koppa - Hebbur Hobli, Tumkur Taluk

Re the regd petn of 1.3.34 filed by them appealing against the order of the M.C. re: their claim for certain amounts of pay & pakibaka for Oct 19 - to the end of Dec 1919.

The petitioners are informed that the petition is rejected as there are no reasons to interfere with the order of the M.C. in the matter.

M: Reg/dc

WD 01956—GPB—22,500—12-6-34

For Chi Sec.

for information 1074 Encl 4 files · 913-D

Copy to M.C.J. regarding records received

1 — Endorsement No 1267 dt 18 12.34
33-34

BO

For Chi Sec

Before The Second Member of Council

To H.H. The Maharaja of Mysore

Bangalore.



Interview Memo.

Petitioners :- Krishnamachar and 4 other Temple servants of Shri Anjaneya Swami Temole, Garagada Koppe, Hebbur Hobli, Tumkur Taluk.

*****

(i). Pay and Paditara charges amounting to Rs 456-0-0 for the period from October 1918 to end of December 1919 became due to the petitioners for services actually rendered and charges actually incurred by them during the period.

(ii). The Taluk , Sub - Division, and District Office Authorities have duly recognised the above claims and recommended sanction to the Bills therefor to the Muzrai Commissioner.

(iii). The petitioners have been on and often duly agitating for the settlement of their legitimate claims before all the Officers concerned with the matter from 1918 up-to-date, but in vain.

Chief Secretary with compliments.

(iv). The Muzrai Commissioner , to whom the bills were submitted for sanction has rejected the claim on the grounds that it was belated and there were no sufficient reasons for the delay. The petitioners are in no way responsible for this delay caused officially in the several Offices and most emphatically submit that there have been sufficient good grounds to pass their legitimate claims.

(v). Government have endorsed in No. 1073/Muz -33 -4 dated 12/13th Feby' 35 to the petitioners rejecting their petition on the ground that there are no geasons to interfere with the orders of the Muzrai Commissioner in the matter.

(vi). The claims preferred by the petitioners are reasonable ,legitimate ,duly supported and justifiable for settlement as prayed for by them already.

(vii). Their claims require bare, nacked , justice at the hands of the Benign Government and they pray that their request may be - graciously considered sympathetically, in view of the circumstance that they are more sinned than sinning and are in no way at fault.

The above G.O. may kindly be reviewed and the petitioners request granted.

Bangalore,

15-4-1935.

Petitioners.